## REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 13, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-13, and 15-24 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 16, and 17 are in independent form. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 1, 6, 16, and 17 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,985,955 (*Gullotta et al.*); Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0174227 (*Hartsell et al.*); Claims 6-8 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,216 (*Steegmans*); Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0043961 (*Torres et al.*) in further view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0009540 (*Benfield et al.*); Claims 12 and 21 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0145093 (*Oren et al.*); Claim 15 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0010671 (*Grannan*); Claim 18 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0161904 (*Tredoux et al.*); Claims 19 and 24 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0064149 (*Elliott et al.*); and Claim 20 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2006/0168253 (*Baba et al.*). Cancellation of Claims 7 and 8 renders their rejections moot. Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 16, and 17, together with

the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part, "assigning said asset to one of a plurality of security domains based on said determining, wherein each security domain corresponds to a respective degree of security control." (Emphasis added.)

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Gullotta et al.* fails to disclose "assigning assets to at least one of a plurality of security domains based on an outcome of a determining step, wherein each security domain respectively includes a different degree of security control." *See* Office Action, page 6. Applicants respectfully disagree, however, with the Office Action's assertion that *Steegmans* teaches such a feature at column 2, lines 39-44.

*Steegmans*, as best understood by Applicants, relates to a system for managing Internet connections routed across an Internet communications network having two or more domains. Each domain is provided with a domain manager and with one or more domain boundary controllers. To assure quality service of Internet connections, the domain manager communicates with the domain boundary controllers and authorizes them to establish and maintain special Internet connections under special conditions across the boundary of the domain into the domain.

*Steegmans*, at column 2, lines 39-44, recites, "the domain manager manages all the resources required by internet connections within the domain to which it is assigned. This permits the dynamic assignment of network resources to users, as well as the implementation of security checks and charge metering for these resources." (Emphasis added.) Apparently, this portion of *Steegmans* discusses assigning domains to domain managers and resources to users, not assets to security domains.

Nothing has been found in *Steegmans* that is believed to teach, suggest, or otherwise result in "assigning said asset to one of a plurality of security domains based on said determining, wherein each security domain corresponds to a respective degree of security control," as recited in Claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of *Gullotta et al.* and *Steegmans*, as applied against the independent claims herein.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Gullota et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Independent Claims 16 and 17 include a feature similar to that discussed above. Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2175207_1